REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough consideration provided in the present application. Claims 1-12 are currently pending in the instant application. Claims 1, 2, and 4 have been amended. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, and 10-12 are independent. Reconsideration of the present application is earnestly solicited.

Reasons for Entry of Amendments

At the outset, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered into the Official File in view of the fact that the amendments to the claims automatically place the application in condition for allowance.

In the alternative, if the Examiner does not agree that this application is in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered for the purpose of appeal. This Amendment was not presented at an earlier date in view of the fact that Applicants did not fully appreciate the Examiner's position until the Final Office Action was reviewed.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. Specifically, claims 4 and 10-12 have been allowed and the subject matter of claims 8 and 9 has been indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Lee (U.S. Patent No. 5,546,134). Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Yoshida et al. (U.S. Patent Publ. No. 2004/0165070) in view of Christoff et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,518,998). Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Yoshida et al. in view of Christoff et al., and further in view of Eino (U.S. Patent No. 6,120,435). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 1 and 2

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance the prosecution of the present invention, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements directed to a camera, including *inter alia*

a controller connected to an imaging part and an image processing circuit;

the controller being adapted to determine a brightness level of the digital video signals obtained by the imaging part and to output a command control signal to the image processing circuit,

the image processing circuit being adapted to receive the command control signal from the controller, and to automatically correct the digital video signals according to the determined brightness level.

In addition, independent claim 2 has been amended to recite a combination of elements directed to a camera, including *inter alia*

a signal processing part including a correcting part;

a controller connected to an imaging device and the signal processing part, the controller including a brightness determining part adapted to receive the digital video signals outputted from the signal processing part and adapted to determine a brightness level of the received digital video signals, the controller also including a correction amount determining part adapted to determine a correction amount for the digital video signals according to the brightness level of the digital video signals determined by the brightness determining part, and the controller being adapted to output a command control signal to the correcting part;

the correcting part of the signal processing part adapted to receive the command control signal from the controller, and to automatically correct the digital video signals according to the correction amount determined by the correction amount determining part.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of elements set forth in each of independent claims 1 and 2 is not taught or suggested by the references cited by the Examiner, including Lee.

In claim 1 of the present invention, a controller, which is connected to both an imaging part and an image processing part, outputs a command control signal to the image processing circuit. The image processing circuit then automatically corrects the digital video signal.

In claim 2 of the present invention, a controller, which is connected to both an imaging part and a signal processing part, outputs a command control signal to the correcting part of the signal processing part. The correcting part then automatically corrects the digital video signal.

By contrast, as can be seen in Lee column 4, line 66 to column 5, line 11, this document merely discloses an APL calculator 20 connected to a look-up table 30.

As best understood by the Applicant, nowhere in the Lee document is there any hint of a controller, which is connected to both an imaging part and an image processing part, outputting a command control signal to the image processing circuit (as in independent claim 1); or

a controller, which is connected to both an imaging part and a signal processing part, outputting a command control signal to the correcting part of the signal processing part (as in independent claim 2).

At least for the reasons set forth above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of features set forth in each of claims 1 and 2 is not disclosed or suggested by the references cited by the Examiner, including Lee.

Therefore, independent claims 1 and 2 are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 6

The Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 6 as currently written sets forth a combination of elements not suggested by the references cited by the Examiner.

Independent claim 6 as currently written recites a combination of elements directed to a camera, including *inter alia*

wherein said microcomputer is adapted to obtain a correction value from the EEPROM according to the determined brightness level of the digital image signals and to output a command control signal to the image signal processing circuit for automatic correction processing of the digital image signals.

By contrast, as can be seen in Yoshida et al. paragraph [0052] and in FIG. 4, this document merely discloses an analog gain control amplifier 54 for adjusting the analog image signal.

Further, as can be seen in Christoff et al. column 3, line 65 to column 4, line 7 and FIG.1, this document merely discloses a gain value (of analog amplifier A (120)) computed in response to comparing a brightness value to a threshold. The analog amplifier then adjusts the brightness of the image.

In view of the above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of elements set forth in independent claim 6 is not disclosed or suggested by the references cited by the Examiner, including Yoshida et al. and Christoff et al.

Therefore, independent claim 6 is in condition as currently written.

As identified by the Examiner, each of the references cited by the Examiner, including, Lee, Yoshida et al., and Christoff et al., fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed limitation of independent claims 1, 2, and 6. Accordingly, these rejections should be withdrawn. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejections are respectfully requested.

Dependent Claims

As to the dependent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable due to their dependence upon an allowable independent claim, as well as for additional limitations recited by these claims.

For example, dependent claim 7 recites "a switch for choosing a command correction processing mode or a non-correction processing mode" for the camera".

By contrast, as can be seen in the Eino document column 7, line24-30, this document merely discloses a switch A, B which enables COU 27 to control the gain of gain control amplifier. Thus, the Eino switch does not teach the switch 28 of the present invention.

Accordingly, independent claim 1, 2, 6, and dependent claims 3, 5, and 7-9 which are now in condition for allowance.

Amendments to Allowed Claim 4

The Examiner will note that a non-narrowing amendment has been made to independent claim 4. No change has been made that would effect the allowability of allowed claim 4.

Accordingly, all of the claims of the present application should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Carl T. Thomsen, Registration No. 50,786 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: JUL 6 2006

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By ______________________

Marc S. Weiner
Reg. No. 32,181

P. O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

MSW/CTT/ktp